

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



00006139310

LOYALTY TO THE GOVERNMENT.

S P E E C H

OF

HON. PETER HITCHCOCK,

OF GE AUGA,

IN THE OHIO SENATE, MARCH 4, 1863,

ON

The Loyalty Resolutions of Mr. Welsh.

MR. PRESIDENT :—Fearfully is the country agitated with the gigantic struggles of the Government in vindicating and sustaining itself against the combined attacks of open and covert treason.

War exists. A war, terrible in nature, fearful in extent, desperate in the struggles of its contending forces, fierce and desolating in its progress, and appalling in the magnitude of the consequences involved.

It exists not on account of conflicting jurisdiction with neighboring nations—not by attacks upon the commerce of the country—not by invasion of a foreign foe attempting in the fierce tribunal of arms to settle long disputed questions of international comity, but by the act of traitors, rebels in arms against the Government. They, the prime movers, instigators of this rebellion, and leaders in its efforts, being the representatives of the recipients of the richest blessings of the Government, under which this whole people has become so great, and in time past has been so prosperous and happy. Not only so, but these same men, and those associated with them with like views of Governmental policy, have administered the Government of the country almost the entire time for the past forty years. More than this, they were administering it at the time of the breaking out of this rebellion; and more yet, they continued to administer it, or take part in its administration for weeks, yes, months after States to which they themselves belonged had seceded; and forts, arsenals, dock yards, mints, and other property belonging to the United States had been taken possession of by rebels acting under their advice, and by their direction.

The Chief Executive of the so-called Confederate States, his Cabinet officers, his foreign emissaries, many of his Generals in the field, and of the members of the Confederate Congress, were thus acting in the Executive and Legislative Departments of the General Government; at the same time they were not only aiding and abetting, but *counselling* and *directing* treason. One of those Generals, in his capacity of Vice President of the United States, adjourned the Senate on the 4th of March, 1861, took the oath of fealty to the Constitution as a Senator in the new Congress, drew his

pay and mileage, and immediately went out to take his place in the army of rebellion, and war against the Government he had just sworn to support.

About two years since, in anticipation of a contingency which might arise, the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, by a vote almost or quite unanimous, passed a resolution pledging the entire resources of the State, moral and physical, in aid of the Government in sustaining the Constitution, and crushing out rebellion. The anticipated contingency happens—war exists—exists as has been before suggested, by the act of rebels in arms. Congress passes a resolution known as the “Crittenden Resolution.” The Legislature of Ohio affirms, and the Legislatures of other loyal States affirm this resolution. For it, a certain class of Senators profess very high regard, although in a State Convention of the party, with which those Senators act, holden in this city on the 4th day of July, 1862, the first clause of that resolution is omitted, and the like omission occurs in a series of resolutions introduced in the House by a member of the same party a few days since. Why? Because the clause omitted, fixes the responsibility on rebels where it belongs. That clause of the resolution says: “That the present deplorable civil war has been forced upon the country by the *disunionists of the Southern States*, now in arms against the Government, and in arms around the Capitol.”

It is under these circumstances the existence of war in the country, a war for the preservation of its government, in the language of the resolution quoted, “*forced upon the country by the disunionists of the South*,” as declared by the solemn act of Congress and of State Legislatures—a war taxing the entire resources of the country for its conduct, and to aid in which Ohio has given her solemn pledge, that we come to the consideration of the resolutions before the Senate.

They are as follows:

WHEREAS, A republican form of government is believed to rest largely upon the consent of the governed, and can only be maintained when war is waged for its destruction by a hearty co-operation of the loyal people of such government.

WHEREAS, The Constitution of the United States founded by the wisdom and patriotism of our fathers, very wisely provided for a government of legislative, judicial and executive departments, with power believed to be ample to defend the rights of the people, maintain the authority of the government and execute the laws of the nation; and

WHEREAS, An unholy warfare is now waged by certain States against the authority of the legally constituted government of the country, and as no provision is made by the Constitution for the suppression of a rebellion, and the enforcement of the laws, except through the legally constituted authorities of the country, and as the execution of the laws, in a republican or democratic form of government, depends largely upon the loyalty and patriotism of the people; therefore,

Resolved by the General Assembly of the State of Ohio, That we deem it proper as the representatives of the people, to renew our pledges in the name of the people of the State to the General Government, to render it all the aid within our power, both morally and physically, in its laudable efforts to put down the rebellion, preserve the Constitution and restore the Union.

Resolved, That it is with pain and mortification, that we hear of the propositions of either persons or parties in the North to divide the loyal States with the ultimate design of attaching any portion of those States to the so-called Southern Confederacy; and that we do, in the name of the people of the State of Ohio, most solemnly protest against such a heresy; believing that it not only proposes the destruction of the Constitution and of the Union, but would, if encouraged, result finally in the probable overthrow of our civil liberties.

Resolved, That any attempt by persons or parties in the North to divide the territory of the Union, while the General Government is waging war for its preservation, is an act of disloyalty—giving aid and comfort to the enemies of the country—and is deserving the severest reprehension and condemnation of all loyal men and good citizens.

What patriotic heart but beats responsive to the sentiments contained in these resolutions? Does any one oppose them? It would seem that such opposition must identify the individual or party making it, with the opposers of the Government. They simply embody a renewal of the pledge made two years since, and this is done in calm and dignified, but earnest and decided language. They contain no party

dogma, interfere with none, nor attempt to make any party platform. Divested, as would seem to be the fact, of every thing which might be deemed objectionable, they present simply the question of loyalty or disloyalty to the Government. I cannot see how any man who is disposed to stand by his country in this hour of difficulty and danger, giving to her deliverance his best energies can do other than sustain these resolutions.

But the Senator from Ashland thinks differently, and proposes to amend by striking out of the first resolution the words "both morally and physically," and "laudable," and inserting "constitutional," so that it would read "in its constitutional efforts to put down the rebellion, preserve the constitution," &c.

"Constitutional efforts to preserve the constitution," hardly makes good sense, but the purpose of this amendment is easily understood. It is to form the basis of an attack upon the Administration in the conduct of the war, and right well have those advocating it improved the opportunity.

In continuing this discussion I do not stand here as the apologist or defender of the Administration. It needs none such. Nor by this am I understood as endorsing all it has done, for there have been things I would have preferred differently. Yet, confiding in the unsullied integrity and devoted patriotism of the President, there is no doubt in my mind that history and an impartial future will do him justice in awarding him the meed of well earned praise.

Neither is it my purpose to follow the course of other Senators in determining the positions of parties upon the issues which are involved, as shown by declarations made and resolutions adopted in times past. These have been sufficiently discussed by others.

While I cannot hope, where so much has been said, to say anything new, what is said shall have reference to the present time and condition of things. With the motives of men I have nothing to do, and shall say nothing. If they be found in untenable positions, it is the necessary sequence of their words and acts, and as such only shall they be spoken of.

Starting with the proposition, which all will admit, that it is the duty of every loyal man in the whole country to give his entire energies, so far as they may be needed, to the support of the Government in this struggle for its existence, and that every resource of the country should be subsidized to the same end,—another inevitably follows: That there is a dividing line between the supporters and opposers of the Government, upon one or the other side of which every man places himself. No matter whether, in taking any position he may, he is aware of the fact or not—it is nevertheless true. The conclusion cannot be avoided. He is either for or against the Government. There is no neutrality in this war. There can be none. All the power of the Government is demanded to carry on this contest. That power rests in the people. The people are the Government. The Executive and Legislative departments of the Government, so termed, are only the agents of that Government, executing its will, and the withholding of the energies of any one man, rightly demanded for its support, cripples, and to that extent opposes, the administration of the Government in its efforts to sustain itself and maintain its supremacy.

He who in arms attempts the overthrow of the Government—he who sympathizes with and encourages this attempt—he who attacks the credit of the government, denounces its administration, frowns when it succeeds, and laughs at its failures, and he who quietly folds his hands, saying, this is none of my concern; I am not responsible for, and will take no part in its settlement, is alike guilty of opposition. If there be difference, it is in favor of that one who, believing it right, however false that opinion may be, fights for it, rather than the one who, thinking to avoid responsibility, stands back silently praying for its success, while he waits, with illy concealed hopes therefor.

Having said thus much, I turn to examine the position taken by Senators in this discussion. The Senator from Perry (Mr. Finck,) tells us that "he is for the support of the Government and continuance of the Union," and "that he will never consent to any dismemberment thereof," "that he sustained the Administration in the

conduct of the war up to the time of the issuing of the President's emancipation proclamation, but that he will do so no longer." That act he considers unconstitutional, unwarrantable and impolitic, and therefore his support is withheld. He is "not in favor of withdrawing the army," and as a member of Congress to which he is elect, "he will vote to feed and clothe it," but farther than this he will do nothing to encourage the loyal people of the North to engage in, and prosecute the war for the restoration of the Union. His policy, like that of Governor Seymour of New York, declared a little time since, is one of opposition to the Administration in its efforts to suppress rebellion. Not to indicate any decided policy, but simply to stand in opposition, doing nothing. As before indicated, this is virtually opposition to the Government, and the object is evidently, if not professedly, to hinder and defer the consummation of the war for two years until a change of the Administration can be effected. No one, taking the position he does, proposes to revolutionize and turn out the present Administration until it can be done through the ballot box; and the inevitable result of the course suggested by the Senator is as stated. The country, in the meantime, is to be held in its present deplorable condition, while the men in our army continue to suffer, sicken and die, the public debt to increase, and all the horrors of war be experienced until such a change can be brought about as will secure the management of the war in accordance with the Senator's own notions. Is this true loyalty?

The Senator dates his principal objection to the conduct of the war, from the issuing of the President's emancipation proclamation. As to the policy or impolicy of that act, its constitutionality or unconstitutionality, they have been so fully discussed, I shall not attempt a repetition of the arguments made, or to adduce new ones. It is sufficient for me to say, I have no doubt of the *power* of the President to issue that proclamation as a war measure, and have just as little doubt of his duty to do so, whenever, in his opinion, occupying the stand point he does, it was necessary to cripple, or would aid in crippling rebellion. To it he was bound by his heaven registered oath, and impelled by the impulse of an honest, patriotic heart.

It is a little strange, however, and indicates a little remaining consideration on the part of the Senator, and those who act with him, for the feelings of those with whom they have been politically associated in times past, and of whom we sometimes speak as our "erring brethren," that when you touch rebels where their strength lies, they should all at once have such a holy horror of constitutional violation. The leaders in this rebellion are striving to establish a government whose corner stone is slavery. In their efforts, their great element of strength is slavery. While white men in their army fight the battles of Rebeldom, four millions of slaves are at home engaged in caring for the interests of those men, and raising supplies for the support of that army. More than this, they are pressed into service and made to dig trenches, raise fortifications and even hold arms and shoot bullets by which our brothers, sons and friends are wounded and killed. Yet, if you strike at, or in any way interfere with this system, though it be necessary to save the nation, the Senator is horrified.

Other acts to which he objects are the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus and arrests made by the order of the President. He tells us "that it was enough to startle any loyal man" when the President ordered arrests of those countenancing rebellion, discouraging enlistments, opposing drafts, etc. Who? And why? No man need be startled unless he had some sentiment in common. Loyal men were in no danger of arrest, and certainly would not object to the confinement of disloyal persons in a time like this. But it was an assumption or abuse of power, and in this was the reason for being startled. An assumption of power for the Government to attempt taking care of itself! Search the Constitution and you will find, if not in words, the idea—"this Government can take care of itself," running through the entire instrument. I have yet to learn of the first truly loyal man who has been made to suffer from the suspension of the habeas corpus act.

The Senator claims that I misstate his position. He does not claim that what he said is misstated, and upon this he must allow me to put the construction which the language implies.

MR. JOHNSTON. If public opinion should be clearly against the policy of the Administration, to the extent that the great body of the people believe it would lead to the destruction of the Government, would you adhere to and support the Administration in such a policy?

MR. HITCHCOCK. The question hangs upon a contingency which does not now exist. The Senator seems to refer to the expressions of public opinion in the result of popular elections, when such result may be brought about by party engineering and unwarranted manœuvring on the part of a few persons having personal and unjustifiable opposition to the government. Such result being then falsely claimed as a verdict against the administration of the Government, when such was not, in any sense, the purpose of a large proportion of those by whose action it was secured. Wait until there is such an expression, based simply upon the naked question, unaided by other issues and influences, and we will be better able to answer.

The Senator from Ashland (Mr. Kenny,) exhibits his opposition, in an attempt to discourage the people of the country, by disparaging the conduct, and attempting to render odious the necessary results of the war. He read a collection of figures from some of the newspapers of the day, by which he attempted to show that there had been already issued by the Treasury Department notes and bonds to the amount of over \$2,000,000,000, and a debt to that amount incurred, while as a matter of fact, not one-fourth of that amount had been issued. This he must have known, if he had paid any attention to the report of the Secretary of the Treasury. He included therein the full amount that Department is authorized to issue in any event, and of this more than \$300,000,000 is, in his estimate, included twice. In addition to this he gives the impression that the provision made by Congress was only for the payment of expenses already incurred, while, in truth, it is intended to meet every possible contingency until the 1st of July, 1864.

He will not encourage and sustain the Administration in the prosecution of the war for the Union. "Will not go into the army unless drafted, and it will take a *strong draft* to hold him." His declaration sounds very much like another read by the Senator from Fayette in the course of his remarks, from the "Marion County Mirror," in which the editor of that paper says: "For our part we shall oppose the draft. If Old Abe or his minions arrest us for this, we will submit to the arrest, *if the people say so, and not without.*" These, taken in connection with telegraphic signals of approval, passing between Senators upon this floor, as the quotation above referred to was read, irresistibly force upon my mind the conclusion that there is a determination on the part of some to resist the Government in its attempt to add to, or fill up its army. I will not ask, is this loyalty?

The Senator after denouncing in the bitterest terms the acts of the Administration in its conduct of the war says, "but notwithstanding all this, you ask us to endorse it." In this he is simply mistaken.

While we would rejoice that every man should be arrayed on the side of his country, it is for himself to choose. If by that choice he takes position with the opposition, he, with those with whom he unites his fortunes, must take the consequences. Only let him take position decidedly, so that we may know where to find him.

The Senator from Clermont (Mr. Johnston) comes to us and pleads that all "strife and bickering may be done away with" in this hour of difficulty and danger. This appeal is truly patriotic, and to it every loyal heart responds approval. Who was it that in 1861 proposed that all party organizations should be abandoned, and the whole people unite in the support of the Government, but the friends of the Administration? And who rejected that proposition, but its opponents with whom the Senator acts? Having in strong language portrayed the course and policy of the Administration in carrying on the war, and denounced it with fierce invective, he, in language of earnest eloquence,—I would be glad if my frail powers would equal,—declares "the Republic is rushing madly on to ruin,—fanaticism rules the hour;" and then calls upon the people "to arise in their might, and at the Spring elections rebuke this fanaticism which rules the Administration in the conduct of this war. And yet he wants party

strife done away with. Not one word as to the rebellion and the danger to the Republic from the combined attacks of rebels. No. All the danger in the mind of the Senator is in assumptions of power and constitutional encroachments by the President.

MR. JOHNSON. I have denounced and do denounce the rebellion as an unholy, unjustifiable rebellion, and the actors in it as liable to the severest condemnation.

MR. HIRCHCOCK. Yes, the Senator denounces the rebellion, but does he call upon the people to "arise in their might," and crush it out? No, he does not do so. He expressly says he will not. From the time of the adoption of the present policy of the President in the conduct of the war, his support has been withheld, and shall continue to be so until the President comes back to such a conduct of the war as shall suit him. His support, like that of the Senator from Perry, depends upon the adoption of a policy such as he would mark out. *All Rebellion* would be loyal, allowing them to fix the *terms* of their loyalty. He earnestly calls upon the people "to rebuke fanaticism at the Spring elections," and still asks that party strife may be laid aside.

The Senator tells us that the Crittenden resolution is the "Shorter Catechism of the political church" to which he belongs, but forgot or neglected to say, that the "Shorter Catechism," before being adopted by them as their creed, had been very much abbreviated by leaving out these words: "That the present deplorable war has been forced upon the country by the disunionists of the South, etc.," being the first clause of that resolution in which a division was demanded when passing Congress, and which is the basis and soul of the whole resolution.

For what purpose was this done? Only to admit of their charging the responsibility of the war elsewhere than upon those who have taken up arms to overthrow the Constitution and destroy the Union. The Senator to this end quotes from declarations of individuals in different parts of the country, made previous to the commencement of this contest, and to party action, attempting to show in these declarations and in that action an excuse for this outbreak. What does he mean? and for what is this showing made! It can be only that thereby an influence may be created by which partisan success may be gained and ultimate power secured.

No sword had been unsheathed, no gun fired, and no embattled hosts arrayed against the Government, until it was done by the leaders of this accursed, *causeless* rebellion. And yet it is sought to fix the responsibility elsewhere than on those leaders.

The Senator thinks there is no hope of preserving the Union upon the policy of the Administration, and attempts to show, by declarations of individuals made both before and since the commencement of this contest, that, in the carrying on of this war, ulterior purposes, and not the Constitution, were paramount. I deny the charge, and pronounce the proof insufficient. The Senator says these individuals are sustaining the Administration, and asks for my indorsement of their positions. My answer is this: As every Senator in the opposition, who has taken part in this discussion, has declared that he spoke only for himself, so do I for myself, nor do I indorse the position of any other man, except so far as that be mine. If those men are ready, and just so far as they are ready, to sustain the Administration in its Herculean labors, my hand shall be joined to theirs, and no inquiry be raised as to ulterior objects they may have in thus aiding the Government. With all who shall bear up the hands of the Government, and strive for its integrity, my feeble efforts shall be united.

The Senator professes—would that it was more than profession—fear as to the effect produced in the South by the difference of sentiment manifested in this discussion, and especially by a divided vote upon the resolutions before us. He fears it will "give aid and comfort to the rebels." To prevent this, he asks that the amendment may be agreed to, and thus secure a unanimous vote. He forgets that the resolutions are satisfactory to the majority, and contain just the expression they would like to make. That it is too much to ask a large majority to change, to gratify a small minority. If the proposition be such as that minority cannot support, its rights are secured by voting against it. It is for those constituting that minority to determine for themselves.

MR. FINCK. I desire to ask of the Senator his real objection to the amendment?

MR. HITCHCOCK. If changed, the language will be tautological, less expressive, and not so fully convey the intended purpose in the declaration to be made.

But the Senator from Clermont fears the effect: I tell the Senator that it makes but little difference how he or any of us vote upon this floor, so far as this is concerned, provided the position we occupy, as relates to our supporting the Administration, is known.

The President and his Cabinet officers, constituting the Executive Department, as they execute the laws of Congress, are the legally constituted authorities of the Government. There is no other agency, no power on earth by which this Government can be sustained except through those authorities. To them do these armed hosts of traitors look as the representatives of the Government, and at them strike blows aimed for its destruction.

The administration now represents these authorities. As we bear up its hands and sustain its efforts, rebellion suffers and rebels are discouraged. On the other hand, when we withhold that support and denounce its policy, they are encouraged. The very denunciations of the policy of the President made by the Senator, and more especially his effort to prevent saying in the resolutions that we pledge ourselves to sustain "*all laudable efforts to crush out this rebellion,*" necessarily has the very effect he deprecates, to give "*aid and comfort*" to those seeking to destroy the Union. He cannot avoid it and must abide the consequences.

To show that this is true, that the rebels are greatly encouraged by any and all opposition to the President's policy in the North, permit me to quote a brief extract from the Richmond Enquirer, published at the Capitol of the so-called Confederate States, under date of Feb. 12, 1863:

"Amongst the foreign relations of the Confederacy, none is at this moment more interesting than our relations with the States of Indiana and Illinois. "*Democratic*" Yankee Senators in those States bring in strings of resolutions denouncing Lincoln's government and proclamation, and declaring that they are not going to fight any more for the negro. This is all very well, and *highly encouraging to us*, as proving distraction and discouragement in the enemy's camp."

The Senator need have no fear of rebels being notified of the fact that there are sympathizers at the North. They seem well posted.

MR. FINCK. Will the Senator allow me to read further from the same article?

MR. HITCHCOCK. Certainly, sir. I will be obliged to the Senator if he will read the whole of it.

MR. FINCK reads:

"But it is also well for us to understand once for all, that the whole affair means simply, *exclusively*—that they, the Democrats, ought to have the conduct and profits of the 'War for the Union'—that it is a Democratic finance minister who ought to have the striking off of greenbacks; Democratic contractors who ought to supply army and navy; Democratic Generals who ought to lead; Democratic printers who ought to print, and Democratic thieves who ought to steal," &c.

MR. HITCHCOCK. I thank the Senator for the extract. There is but one possible objection to it; its introduction into my speech of a party name, which was in opposition to my original intention, and has been studiously avoided. The extract read by myself proves conclusively that opposition at the North to the administration "*is highly encouraging*" to the rebels, while that read by my friend proves as certainly that the impression made on my mind by the position of the Senator, was concurred in by others. That he would hold the country in its present position, continuing, but not prosecuting the war until such time as a Democratic triumph could be secured, and the administration changed.

The Senator from Monroe (Mr. O'Connor) asks, "What would have been the condition of the country if the Democratic party had done what traitors expected of them?" In a convention holden in this city just before the breaking out of the re-

bellion, they had resolved "that 200,000 Democrats would stand between the South and coercion." He tells us, "the rebels were surprised when the war first commenced, at the unanimity with which all parties rushed to the standard of the country."

From the Senator's manner in asking the above question, and the general tone of his remarks, I was impressed with the idea thereby conveyed, that having so long stood by the country when its administration was in other hands, there could be no complaint if the Democracy should now take the position which it was originally expected to occupy.

MR. O'CONNOR. The Senator states the language used by me correctly, and in addition thereto I stated, "that if the Government should succeed in crushing out this rebellion, very much of the credit would be due to the Democratic party," but I deny the construction put upon my remarks.

MR. HITCHCOCK. I am glad to afford the Senator the opportunity of explaining. My conclusions may have been unjust, but were such as were forced upon me. As to what he says of credit due the Democratic party, I feel that all, who forgetting self and casting aside party feeling, gave themselves to the noble work of saving the heritage handed down to us from our fathers, and have thus continued to labor through all the storms that beat upon them, and all the vicissitudes they have been called upon to pass through, are equally entitled to credit. This, the highest which can be passed upon any, is their encomium: *They have done their duty.*

I have confidence that there are yet enough honest, loyal hearts among the masses of those heretofore acting with that party, to stand by and sustain those who uphold the Constitution and the Union, to secure a speedy and overwhelming triumph. Would that the position of Senators here was such as to aid this result.

The Senator from Clermont referred to a remark made by the Senator from Cuyahoga, denouncing it as implying a principle detestable in itself, and an outrage upon all sense of right and justice. What was the declaration which so excited the ire of the gentleman. This, that while he was for the preservation of the Government with slavery, he would thank God more mightily, *if possible*, that it might be preserved *without* slavery. The language is simply that, if it might be possible in his fullness of gratitude at the preservation of the nation, though it be with slavery, he would render yet more earnest thanksgiving for its preservation without slavery.

Understanding him thus, I adopt the sentiment as my own, and would rejoice if able to enforce it in language as eloquent and powerful as that of the Senator himself. If acquainted with my own impulses that desire, which is uppermost in my heart, is that the Government may be vindicated, the Union perpetuated and the country saved, even though slavery, for the time being, remain. The cause of freedom, of free institutions and of human progress demands the salvation of this country.

While feeling thus, if it be possible for any purpose to lie deeper in my heart, and take a stronger hold of its aspirations, and welling up therefrom to overflow of more abundant thankfulness, it would be that the Government may be continued and the Union preserved without slavery. Yes, it would be a double cause of rejoicing to see our country safe, purified and emancipated from that accursed system which has been the cause of all our difficulties. Attempt to disguise the fact as we may, it is nevertheless true, that herein is the cause to be sought. As prophesied by the hero and statesman, Andrew Jackson, if no more than a pretext, it is *the pretext* for the wickedest and most causeless rebellion ever conspiring since the secession of the arch-fiend of darkness from the world of light.

To this choice, that the Union should be preserved without slavery, the Senator from Clermont has taken exception, and I would like to ask him the question, whether **he** would prefer the preservation of the Union and the continuance of the Government with or without slavery? and would thank him for a direct answer.

MR. JOHNSTON. I would prefer the war should be conducted without reference to slavery. I would prefer that slave property should not be regarded at all in the con-

duct of the war—that slave property should take its fate along with all other property.

MR. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is aware that he has not answered the question.

MR. JOHNSTON. I have answered it as fully as others have answered me.

MR. HITCHCOCK. The Senator declines to answer. Very well. So far as his declaration goes, we agree. His argument, however, as that of others on his side, is entirely at variance with his declaration. The whole drift and scope of it being to show that slave property should be held particularly sacred.

Had I been conducting this war, my purpose at the commencement would have been as it seems to me was the policy of the President, to carry it on without reference to slavery. When by the force of circumstances slavery was recognized as an element in the war, as I believe the President was convinced it was when he issued his Emancipation Proclamation, I would have said, *Slavery, STAND FROM UNDER*. Where it stands in the way of sustaining the Government, *let the Governmental car roll on*. My faith in the “patriarchal” institution is not great, and in its “Christianizing” influences far less. On this point let the long list of heathenish barbarities perpetrated by rebels during this contest testify.

The Senator would have property in slaves take its chances with other property. Exactly. But when in that property is a rebel’s strength, take it from him. If you need it, use it, but mind it is never returned to him again. He has forfeited all claim to it.

Thank Heaven, slavery is doomed, not because the President issued his Proclamation—not because in the conduct of this war he has sought this end, or that his Administration has been directed to it only as a means of crushing the rebellion; but because an all-wise, overruling Providence has decreed it as the result of this contest, and all the powers of earth and the infernal regions combined cannot prevent it.

The Senator derives great comfort from the fact that the author of these resolutions, the Senator from Belmont, (Mr. Welsh,) as also Gov. Johnson of Tennessee, who addressed the General Assembly a short time since, declared that they would not have issued the Proclamation. The difference between these gentlemen and the Senator is, that, while he denounces the Administration and opposes its conduct of the war, refusing to sustain the Government on this account, they yield to it an earnest and untiring support. They do not doubt the constitutionality, only the policy of that act, and with true loyalty regard duty to the Government as above all questions of policy.

It is the duty, as it should be the pleasure of every loyal person to yield a cheerful and hearty support to the Administration of the Government, and especially so when it is violently attacked and threatened with overthrow. Opposition to the constituted authorities of the Government, is opposition to the Government itself. The conclusion is inevitable. It cannot be avoided. Those authorities determine the course to be pursued, and no individual has the right, because he does not approve of that course, to withhold his support or throw his energies in opposition. Let each individual become a judge of the policy to be pursued, and govern his actions accordingly, and the sure consequence is interminable confusion and inevitable defeat. We have our own views and the right to express them, we will exercise that right, but this should make no difference with our undivided support of the constituted authorities of the Government.

Setting aside preconceived notions and private opinions, loyal men must, they *will* come to the support of the authorities in this terrific struggle.

It costs sacrifices. Of opinion? Yes. What are the sacrifices of opinion in comparison with such as are made by those who leaving home and comfort, kindred and friends, have gone forth to fill the serried ranks of our armies, there in solid columns, and with a long line of fixed bayonets forming a living bulwark, between our Government and its overthrow. There they stand to suffer and bleed and die, and yet we talk of sacrifice.

I well recollect, perhaps other Senators can ; hundreds of the people of this State have vivid recollections of the feelings with which they have approached the long lines of little mounds on one and another of the fields of strife, where has gone out so much young life amid the roar of battle and the clash of arms.

At such a time how little seem any and all other sacrifices in comparison with giving up a son, a brother, a friend, upon the altar of our country, a sacrifice to propitiate this unholy rebellion.

Forgetting past differences and reckless of personal consequences, let us cast away every preconceived notion of policy, and joining hand to hand, while heart beats responsive to heart, anew pledge ourselves and energies, our State and its resources, to the struggle for the Union.

With entire devotion, unflinching courage, unflagging zeal, resolute purpose and undivided energies, with our eyes fixed upon the Constitution and the Union, unitedly declare, they *must*, they *shall be preserved*.

With unwavering confidence in the justice of our cause, and reliance in integrity of purpose on the part of the Executive, let us yield his administration a hearty support, while we go on in united, fearless and determined effort to crush out this rebellion and perpetuate the Government.

MR. JOHNSTON. If you conscientiously believed the policy of the President would overthrow the Government and destroy the Union, would you still sustain him ?

MR. HITCHCOCK. My fears are not those of the Senator. He fears that in his efforts to save, the President will destroy it. Destroy that which he attempts to save. My fears are from the attacks of armed hosts striking at the vitals of the Government. The case he supposes does not, nor do I believe it can exist. My answer is this : If the Government must be overthrown and the Union destroyed, which I neither admit nor believe,—if the snares set for her are so strong, and the pitfalls surrounding her so deep, that she cannot by possibility escape,—then let her perish in struggles to extricate herself, rather than by the hands of armed assassins she has nourished and brought up.

My motto is, "*My country, may she ever be right ; but right or wrong, my country, her government FOREVER.*"



